

ON THE IDENTIFICATION OF *CTENOTUS SCHOMBURGKII* (PETERS)

In preparation for a paper on the *Ctenotus* of the Eastern Division of Western Australia, I borrowed the types of *Lygosoma schomburgkii* Peters from the Berlin Museum. Two of the specimens belonged to a wide-ranging Western Australian species; the other two could not be matched with any *Ctenotus* I then knew (they were later found to agree with *C. uber orientalis* Storr, 1971). I therefore settled the name *schomburgkii*, by lectotype designation, on the taxon I knew.

Twenty years later, when my usage of the names *schomburgkii* and *uber* is well-established in the literature, Peterson and Shea attempt to upset the above designation on the grounds that the lectotype and paralectotype were not part of Peters' original material. They argue thus:

- (1) *Lygosoma schomburgkii* (*sensu* Storr) does not occur within 50 km of Buchsfeld;
- (2) Boulenger, after examining specimens in the Berlin Museum, placed *L. schomburgkii* in the synonymy of *L. lesueurii*; and
- (3) Peters' description does not fit *Ctenotus schomburgkii* (*sensu* Storr) but agrees "in all respects" with *C. uber orientalis* Storr.

The first two arguments are frivolous grounds for upsetting a lectotype designation, and the third is untrue.

There is no evidence that Schomburgk ever provided Peters with locality data. If he had obtained his specimens of *schomburgkii* in the Murray Mallee, would he have informed Peters of it? The locality "Buchsfeld" applies

more to Schomburgk's place of residence than to the provenance of his specimens. At any rate Peterson and Shea admit that other specimens, apart from *Lygosoma schomburgkii*, could not have come from the vicinity of Buchsfeld.

Boulenger's concept of *Lygosoma lesueurii* was so grossly composite that it tells us nothing about the specimens of *L. schomburgkii* that he may have seen in Berlin. The subdigital lamellae of *L. pantherinum* Peters are finely keeled (as in *L. schomburgkii*) but that did not deter Boulenger from synonymizing *pantherinum* with *lesueurii* (a species whose subdigital lamellae are widely callose).

was composite. His description of the back as "black with four white or green stripes" could only apply to spirit specimens of eastern *Ctenotus schomburgkii* (*sensu* Storr), in spirit specimens of *C. uber orientalis* the back is brown or grey and the stripes brownish white or greyish white. Peters' description of the side of the body is almost as certainly based on the specimens of *C. uber orientalis*.

It is not surprising that Peters was unable to separate two such superficially similar taxa as *Ctenotus schomburgkii* and *C. uber orientalis* (no one could until I pointed the way). Believing his material to comprise a single species, Peters was free to base his description on any or all four of his specimens; and I, as first reviser, was equally free to choose any of them as lectotype.

**ON THE OCCURRENCE OF BRACHYLAIMA SP. (TREMATODA) IN THE
FERAL HOUSE MOUSE, MUS MUSCULUS, IN SOUTH AUSTRALIA**

Summary